DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 222 RC 007 135

AUTHOR	Satterlee, James L.; Riley, Marvin P.
TITLE	Rural Poverty in Three Eastern South Dakota Counties.
INSTITUTION	South Dakota State Univ., Brookings. Agricultural Experiment Station.
SPONS AGENCY	Cooperative State Research Service (DOA), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	SD-AES-Bull-602
PUB DATE	Aug 72
NOTE	17p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Attitudes; *Cultural Factors; *Economic Disadvantagement; Federal Programs; Heads of Households; Health Conditions; Living Standards; Occupations; Residential Patterns; *Rural Areas; *Socioeconomic Influences; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	*South Dakota

ABSTRACT

A sample of 120 low-income families receiving food commodities in 3 eastern South Dakota counties provided a socio-demographic overview of family characteristics; tested the Culture of Poverty approach for classifying rural, low-income families; tested the homogeneity among these families; and presented implications for policy-making and program planning. Findings from the first objective showed: average age of household was 46 years, average education 9 years, employed in agriculture, family size of 6 persons, average family income $2,300, poor housing and facilities, and social isolation. The second objective showed that 14 characteristics of the Culture of Poverty concept were not distributed homogeneously. The significant characteristics of the 3 poverty types were education, occupation, unemployment, mobility, status, anomie, isolation, organization participation, family stability, and attitudes toward education. It was noted that the following areas should be considered in research and program planning: retraining, median age, residence, mass media, organizational participation, isolation, health, and family size. (PS)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

RECEIVED
SEP 7 1973
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

ED 080222

Rural Poverty in Three Eastern South Dakota Counties

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

September 1972
Bulletin 602

Agricultural Experiment Station
South Dakota State University, Brookings

PE 007135

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Objectives 5

Method and Scope 5

Objective I—Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Poverty Families 6

General Characteristics 6

Occupational Characteristics 7

Residential Characteristics 7

Health Conditions 7

Level of Living Characteristics 8

Isolation 8

Family Stability 8

Attitudinal Measures 8

Objective II—The Test for the Culture of Poverty 9

Test of Applicability 9

Objective III—Poverty Types 10

Development of Typology 10

Type I Households 11

Type III Households 11

Type II Households 12

Conclusions and Implications 12

Appendix I 13

Appendix II 14

Bibliography 19

Selected References Relating to Poverty 19

SUMMARY

A sample of 120 low-income families receiving USDA food commodities in three eastern South Dakota counties was studied to: 1) provide a socio-demographic overview of the characteristics possessed by these families; 2) test the applicability of the Culture of Poverty approach for classifying rural, low-income families; 3) attempt to construct a typology based on the extent of homogeneity of heterogeneity exhibited among low-income rural families; and 4) present the implications of the study for policy making and program planning.

Findings from the first objective: average age of household head, 46 years; average education nine years; employment full-time primarily as farm manager or laborer; and family size of six persons. Residential and occupational mobility reflected few moves. Average income for the families was $2,300 per year. Over one-third of the households were experiencing a serious illness with $385 average annual medical cost. Poor housing and facilities were common. Lack of contact with mass media and low participation outside the home reflected social isolation.

The second objective of the study showed that 14 characteristics assigned the poor by the proponents of the Culture of Poverty concept were not distributed homogeneously throughout the sample. Only 29 of 120 families possessed over half of the characteristics with no families possessing all.

Three poverty types were delineated by the extent to which they possessed Culture of Poverty characteristics. Significant characteristics: education, occupation, extent of unemployment, occupational and residential mobility, socio-economic and health status, anomie, isolation, organization participation, family stability, attitudes toward education. Characteristics not significantly associated with poverty: differences in income, birthplace, age and sex of household head, size of family.

The fourth objective was accomplished by presenting the implications for policy making and program planning, based on findings of the first three objectives. Differences among various low-income families, as well as a further refinement of the measures used in the study, must be considered in program projection.

Rural Poverty in Three Eastern South Dakota Counties

by James L. Satterlee
and Marvin P. Riley[1]

INTRODUCTION

The President's National Advisory Commission on rural poverty reported in 1967 that—to the surprise of most Americans—poverty in rural America is greater than in its cities. In metropolitan areas, one person in eight is poor; in the suburbs the ratio is one to fifteen. But in rural areas one in every four persons lives in poverty.[2] The Commission estimates that about 30 percent of our total population lives in rural areas, but 10 percent (14 million) of the nation's poor live there. Contrary to popular impression, the majority are not found on farms, but in small towns and villages. Ten million of the 14 million poor belong to the rural, non-farm segment (small towns under 2,500 population). The remaining four million reside on open country farms. Total farm population in 1967 was estimated at 10,875,000. Consequently, the four million poor on farms constituted nearly 40 percent of the U. S. farm population.

OBJECTIVES

The extensiveness of poverty in rural areas underscores the need to learn more about the characteristics of this substantial segment of rural America. An exploratory study was launched to gain insights into rural poverty families, the "invisible poor."

Objectives: 1) to delineate and describe a number of low-income families in a rural area, 2) to determine the extent to which one or two existing conceptions (the "homogeneity" or "heterogeneity") of the poverty segment in modern American society fits rural, low-income families, 3) to delineate poverty family types, and 4) to present the implications of these findings for public policy making and research regarding the poor.

Selection of a sample of low-income respondents from a rural area and analysis of the socio-demographic characteristics possessed by these families comprised the first step.

The second phase of the study was an evaluation of the applicability to rural poor of the "Culture of Poverty" approach which has been used to describe, classify, and understand other poverty families in America. Homogeneity of selected characteristics among the poor such as high anomie, lack of middle class values, excessive alcoholism, autocratic orientation, and high family instability is a major assumption of this approach.

The third objective of the study hinged upon the second objective, applicability of the "Culture of Poverty" approach. An alternative to classifying the poverty stricken is a typological approach based on heterogeneity of selected characteristics. If the study showed the "Culture of Poverty" approach did not encompass the majority of rural poor as represented by the families selected for this study, then an attempt would be made to determine the presence of possible poverty types within the low-income segment. An analysis of the association of selected variables within these types would be made.

The fourth objective focused on providing implications derived by determining the characteristics of the low-income families, as well as those related to the two conceptions of poverty in America. These took the form of "implications for planning and policy-making" and "implications for further research."

METHOD AND SCOPE

Sample Selection

Identification of low income families who could be considered as in a state of poverty was a difficult task. Unwilling to expose ones situation, validity of responses to questions of income, and isolation of such families in multiple-family dwelling and farmsteads raised numerous questions of sample selection. Since the study was designed as exploratory, i.e. as a means of gaining insights into previously discussed objectives and not as representative of any particular population or area, it was decided to draw a sample from families already classified as being in a condition of "poverty."

Poverty families were identified through the cooperative efforts of a local Community Action Program office. Two criteria—number of persons in the

[1]Dr. James L. Satterlee, assistant professor, and Dr. Marvin P. Riley, professor, Department of Rural Sociology, South Dakota State University.

[2]National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, "The People Left Behind," (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, September 1967), p. 3.

family and the family's monthly income—were used to determine whether a family was eligible for free food under the food commodity program.

Table 1. Food Commodity Eligibility Criteria, 1968.

Household Size	Monthly Income	Household Size	Monthly Income
1 person	$125.00	6 persons	$320.00
2 persons	175.00	7 persons	355.00
3 persons	215.00	8 persons	390.00
4 persons	250.00	9 persons	425.00
5 persons	285.00	10 persons	455.00

*An additional $50.00 for each member over ten in number was allowable.

Liquid Asset Limitations—Allowable liquid assets were $1,000.00 for an individual, $2,000.00 for a family of two, and an added $300.00 for each additional member of a family over two in number.

Income—Income was defined as gross income including assistance grants, less mandatory deductions such as Federal and State income taxes, OASI deduction, and deductions for pension retirement funds, not elective on the part of the employee. Income of the self-employed was the amount remaining after the cost of earning the income had been deleted from gross receipts. Liquid assets include cash, savings accounts, bank accounts, time certification of deposit, stocks, bonds, or any other negotiable readily convertible to cash.

A five-county Community Action Program area included three counties involved in the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Food Commodity Distribution Program; the remaining two counties were involved with the Food Stamp Program. To eliminate differences in type of program, the research effort was focused on three counties utilizing the free commodity program. Basis for research: 126 low-income families. These did not include families on Public Assistance or Social Security, which were deemed atypical of the poverty situation.

Research Instrument and Survey

Information was obtained through an interview schedule designed in four sections to gather 1) general face data, 2) level of living characteristics, 3) occupational characteristics, 4) health status, and 5) family values and orientations.

The final survey was conducted with the help of five Community Action "out-reach people" experienced with low-income families. The interviewers were able to accomplish interviews with 120 of the 126 families selected. Two of the six unobtainable families did not respond because of medical reasons; the remaining four families refused to participate in the survey.

Objective I

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Poverty Families

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

Age

Average age of 120 household heads was about 46 years. Twenty-seven or nearly 23 percent were between 20 and 34, with nearly 30 percent over 55 years of age. (See Appendix II., Table 1).

Sex

Research in urban areas has indicated a high proportion of female household heads. The rural study found, however, that only 20 percent or 24 of the households were headed by a female. (See Appendix II., Table 2).

Martial Status

Eighty-eight families (73 percent) were intact at the time of the survey. Sixteen (13 percent) of the 120 householders were separated or divorced; the remaining 16 were headed by a single individual. (See Appendix II., Table 3).

Education

Average education of household heads was approximately nine and one-half years. About 54 percent had an eighth grade education or less, while 7 household heads had 13 or more years of education. Only

three household heads had less than five years of schooling. (See Appendix II., Table 4).

Size of Family

Average family size was 6.5 persons compared to a national average of 3.6 persons, including parents. Thirteen families were represented by one or two persons and one family possessed 17 members. (See Appendix II., Table 6).

Size of Household

When considering total persons residing in a household, average-size household was approximately five members as opposed to the 6.5 person average family size. Fourteen one-member families accounted for about 12 percent of the total households. And, there were 12 households with ten or more members. (See Appendix II., Table 7).

OCCUPATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Occupation of Household Head

Research from urban centers indicates most poverty families are represented in highly undesirable occupations. Thirty-six of the household heads (30 percent) in this study were employed as farm managers. Farm or non-farm laborers ranked second among household heads with 28 (23 percent). Other occupations mentioned were service workers and craftsmen. An unexpected finding: only four of 120 household heads were unemployed at the time of the survey. (See Appendix II., Table 8.)

Full or Part-Time Employment

One hundred (83 percent) of the household heads were employed full-time with only 16 in part-time employment. (See Appendix II., Table 9.) Ninty-nine (83 percent) of the household heads were single-job holders, the remaining 17 employed heads held more than one job. (See Appendix II., Table 10.)

Extent of Unemployment

One of the characteristics assigned low-income families has been sporadic employment in various occupations. This study indicates that 86 household heads had been fully employed throughout the last year. The remaining 32 household heads indicated they had experienced unemployment varying from four to 240 weeks of continued joblessness. Fourteen of the respondents were involved in relatively "short-time" unemployment from one to 16 weeks. Another 14 had "long-time" unemployment over one-half year. (See Appendix II., Table 11.)

Desire for Retraining

When a family finds itself in a situation unable to provide the minimum level of subsistence, it is assumed the household head would seek occupations which would fulfill these needs. A question whether or not household heads desired a retraining program yielded the following responses: 68 (50 percent) desired no retraining, 38 indicated a desire to retrain, the remaining were undecided. (See Appendix II, Table 12.) The most common reason given for not desiring retraining was satisfaction with present job. Those household heads who did desire training were concerned about bettering their incomes. (See Appendix II., Table 13.) Jobs most often sought by those desiring retraining were mechanical occupations, carpentry, and electronics. (See Appendix II., Table 14.)

Spouse's Occupation

In 66 households (55 percent) where a spouse was present, the spouse was employed full-time within the home. Most common occupations for those employed outside the home were service workers and clerical. (See Appendix II., Table 15.) Family size as indicated previously, would require women to play a major role in child rearing. This may serve as partial answer to the high proportion of spouses remaining in the home.

RESIDENTIAL CHARACTERISTICS

Residence

Three residential segments, "farm", "rural non-farm," and "urban" were represented. Fifty-three families lived on farms, the remaining 67 families in the numerous small towns and one larger urban center within the three-county survey area.

Residential Mobility

Previous studies have indicated that poverty families have traditionally high residential mobility. However, this study indicates the average number of moves per family within their marital lifetime as three. Futhermore, 29 or about one-fourth of the families had never moved since time of marriage, and only three families had moved nine or more times during that period. (See Appendix II., Table 16.) For those who had moved, the most common reason was to change occupation, second, to be closer to relatives. Nearly 45 percent of the household heads had never lived outside the county in which they were born and another 34 percent had never lived outside the state. (See Appendix II., Table 17.)

Home Ownership

About 48 percent of the families were home owners, the remaining 52 percent (62) tenants. (See Appendix II., Table 18.)

HEALTH CONDITIONS

Extent of Serious Illness

Serious illness was present in 44 (37 percent) of the families studied. (See Appendix II., Table 19.) Most often a child suffered from such illness, second, the household head. (See Appendix II., Table 20.) When a serious illness did exist, dental and circulatory problems were most frequently cited. (See Appendix II., Table 21.)

Costs of Medical Care

The average amount spent annually for medicine, doctor bills, and miscellaneous medical care was $385 with average family income in this study about $2300. Approximately 15 percent of the average income was spent for medical care. Over one-fifth of the families spent over $450 for medical expenses. Thirteen families had accrued medical expenses over $1,000 during the year. Another 13 families spent between $450 and $1,000. On the other hand, 21 families (18 percent) accrued less than $50 medical expenses in the last year. (See Appendix II., Table 22.)

A question was asked concerning extent of assistance from outside the household with such medical bills. Seventy-nine (66 percent) of the families indicated they had received no help. Those who did get help received it primarily through welfare and various service organizations. Relatives assisted only three of the 120 families. (See Appendix II., Table 23.)

Insurance

Fifty-six households or approximately 47 percent had no insurance whatsoever. Nineteen households carried only health coverage; 21 families carried only life insurance. Twenty-four households (20 percent) carried both life and health insurance. (See Appendix II., Table 24.)

LEVEL OF LIVING CHARACTERISTICS

Household Facilities

Sixty-five families had no central heating facilities, 21 families had no indoor plumbing, 24 were without indoor toilet facilities, and 26 families had neither a bath nor shower. Only six families were without a refrigerator, and 62 households (52 percent) had home freezers. Thirty-one families indicated no washing machine was present and another 88 families (73 percent) indicated no clothes dryer within the home. (See Appendix II., Table 25.)

ISOLATION

Contact with Media

One hundred sixteen of the 120 families surveyed (98 percent) had access to a radio. Similarly, 106 families (88 percent) had television within the home, but only 81 (67 percent) had a telephone. (See Appendix II., Table 26.) Fifty-three households (44 percent) did not receive a newspaper. Of those families who did receive newspapers, 40 or about one-third subscribed to a daily; the remaining families received either weekly or bi-weekly newspapers. (See Appendix II., Table 27.) Fifty-three families (44 percent) had no access to magazines. Thirty-six families received one or two magazines, and the remaining families subscribed to three to nine magazines. (See Appendix II., Table 28.)

Visiting Patterns

When visiting took place, 89 families (74 percent) most often visited relatives. Only six families visited with neighbors. (See Appendix II., Table 29.)

Organizational Participation

Organizational participation by all family members found the average family in 1.7 groups. (See Appendix II., Table 30.) Included in this list were all organized activities in which children participate such as Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, summer recreation programs, etc. as well as those organizations in which parents take part. Participation was minimal. When participation did occur, it was most often on the part of the wife, usually in some church-related activity.

The main sources of family recreation were watching television and attending auto races.

FAMILY STABILITY

Measures of Stability

A number of questions were asked concerning parent to parent, parent to child, and family to society relationships. In 26 (22 percent) of the families, parents having left home because of conflict was a serious problem. Alcoholism was indicated as a serious problem by 34 (28 percent) of the household heads. Friction between parents and friction between parents and children also were cited as important areas of instability. Twenty-five (21 percent) of the families indicated that parents and their involvement with the law was a serious problem; most often this was associated with families experiencing alcohol problems. (See Appendix II., Table 31.)

ATTITUDINAL MEASURES

Attitudes Toward Education

Urban research indicates that low-income families are highly unfavorable toward education. In this study, however, 78 of the 120 families (65 percent) were favorably oriented toward education.

Anomie

Anomie is a measure of the extent to which one feels alienated or "left out" of society. Previous research indicates a high degree of anomie among poverty people. Using the Srole Anomie Scale, this study indicates that 63 (52 percent) of the 120 families possessed low anomie with the remaining 48 percent characterized by high anomie or alienation.

Present-Future Orientation

Research in urban areas has indicated that poverty families seem to very "present oriented," i.e. living primarily for today and not worrying about tomorrow. The present study indicates, however, that 70 (58 percent) of the families are "future oriented" with only 50 (42 percent) characterized as "present oriented."

Objective II—The Test for the Culture of Poverty

The concept, Culture of Poverty, has been used by a number of writers, as well as persons responsible for designing government programs for the low-income segment, to characterize those in a poverty situation.[3] Proponents of the Culture of Poverty assume that a substantial segment of American society has life values and character patterns totally distinct from those of the larger American society. This segment can be considered a separate, autonomous culture (the "hypothesis of homogeneity"). The implication of projecting this assumption onto the povetry stricken is that programs designed to help the poor often are designed with the idea that the cause of poverty can be found in the midst of the poverty stricken, that one need not focus on the entire society for cause.

A second group of writers and researchers has attempted to question the Culture of Poverty approach on the basis that the true causes of poverty often are neglected when looking only at the poor.[4] They believe one cannot and should not characterize this substantial segment of American Society as being a separate culture. They feel research must focus on society as a whole, not just among the poor, to understand the existence of such a phenomena (the "hypothesis of heterogeneity").

The implication of the second approach is that programs designed to help the poor should offer services and at the same time attempt to question and correct the institutional structure and powerlessness of the poor in resolving poverty problems.

The second objective of this study was to test the existence of a Culture of Poverty among a sample of rural poverty families. Researchers have drawn upon the work of Elizabeth Herzog, who has summarized the Culture of Poverty literature, for fourteen characteristics most commonly attributed to the poor.[5] An attempt was made to measure the extent to which each of these fourteen characteristics was found among families represented in this study.

1. low educational attainment
2. undesirable occupation
3. low level of living
4. high residential mobility
5. low levels of health
6. high perpetuation of poverty from one generation to the next
7. high anomie
8. present orientation rather than future
9. high isolation from the outside
10. more autocratic than democratic
11. little value for education
12. high family instability
13. low economic security (high unemployment)
14. high occupational mobility

TEST OF APPLICABILITY

The following procedure was developed to test the "concept of homogeneity," i.e. whether the fourteen characteristics assigned the poor were absent or present. (See Appendix I.) The researchers suggest that for any family to be classified as being in the Culture of Poverty, it should possess eight of the fourteen characteristics. For families possessing eight or more characteristics, the Culture of Poverty description would be accepted. But, if the family possessed less than eight characteristics, it would not be considered representative of the Culture of Poverty concept (the hypothesis of homogeneity).

In order for the Culture of Poverty scheme to serve as basis for classifying the rural, low-income families represented in this study, it had to fulfill the above requirements. The following table serves as the basis for analyzing the applicability of the concept.

Table 2. Number of Families Possessing Characteristics of the Culture of Poverty

Number of characteristics possessed by the family		Number of families
1	XXX	3
2	XXX	3
3	XXXXX XXXXX X	11
4	XXXXX XXXXX XXXXX XXXXX XXXXX	25
5	XXXXX XXXXX XXXXX XXX	18
6	XXXXX XXXXX XXXXX	15
7	XXXXX XXXXX XXXXX X	16
8	XXXXX XXXXX X	11
9	XXXXX XXXXX X	11
10	XXXXX X	6
11	X	1
12		0
13		0
14		0

[3]See bibliography for contributions by such authors as: F. Frazier, W. Miller, D. Matza and O. Lewis.

[4]See bibliography for contributions by such authors as: K. Clark, T. Gladwin, E. Liebow, and C. Valentine.

[5]Herzog, Elizabeth, "Some Assumptions About the Poor," *The Social Service Review*, XXXVII, (December, 1963), 389-402.

The first column in Table 2 under the "Number of characteristics possessed by the family" refers to the fourteen characteristics representative of the poor. The second column refers to the number of families in this study who possessed a given number of these characteristics. Three families possessed only one of the total fourteen characteristics, and no families possessed more than eleven of the characteristics.

A guideline for testing the applicability of the Culture of Poverty classification was that the family must possess over one-half (eight or more) of the total fourteen characteristics. Only 29 of the total 120 families possessed eight or more and, therefore, could be considered to be of the Culture of Poverty type. On the other hand, 91 of the total 120 families possessed less than one-half of the fourteen characteristics. This finding indicated that, contrary to the hypothesis of homogeneity, a hypothesis of heterogeneity was supported, with the possibility of several poverty types to be found within the rural low-income segment.

Objective III—Poverty Types

Given a finding of heterogeneity among the 120 families, the third objective was to utilize the 14 characteristics of the Culture of Poverty to detect possible povetry types among the sample of rural low-income families. A number of writers have focused attention on designing typologies of the poor based on such characteristics as family stability, economic security, marital status, and precipitating causes of poverty. Each of these attempts has been oriented toward providing a typology based on a few relevant characteristics of the poor.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE TYPOLOGY

On the basis of the distribution of families with regard to possession of the combinations of Culture of Poverty characteristics, a number of types were derived. By examination of the following table (Table 3), it is apparent that one could dichotomize the 120 families into those reflecting the Culture of Poverty with eight or more characteristics and those with less than eight. The result of such a dichotomy indicated 29 families or approximately 24 percent of the sample in the Culture of Poverty type with the remaining 91 families below that level.

Table 3. Poverty Types Based on the Number of Families Possessing Characteristics of the Culture of Poverty

Poverty type	Number of characteristics possessed	Number of families possessing combinations of characteristics	Number of families by characteristics
	1	XXX	3
Type I	2	XXX	3
Poverty	3	XXXXX XXXXX X	11
	4	XXXXX XXXXX XXXXX XXXXX XXXXX	25
Type II	5	XXXXX XXXXX XXXXX XXX	18
Poverty	6	XXXXX XXXXX XXXXX	15
	7	XXXXX XXXXX XXXXX X	16
	8	XXXXX XXXXX X	11
	9	XXXXX XXXXX X	11
Type III	10	XXXXX X	6
Poverty	11	X	1
	12		0
	13		0
	14		0

Stephen Schensul, in a study of low-income families in a rural northern Minnesota community found a group of families in a "twilight zone of poverty" who reflected few of the characteristics usually attributed to the poor.[6] Therefore it was decided to further subdivide the 91 families defined as not representing a Culture of Poverty into two groups: those families possessing four or less characteristics (42 families) were classified as Type I; those families possessing from five to seven characteristics (49 families) were classified as Type II; the remaining 29 families possessing eight or more characteristics were classified as Type III (the Culture of Poverty type).

This typology, based on combinations of the fourteen characteristics possessed by the families, provided a basis for determining the association between the types of low-income families and a number of variables under study. The analysis provided an insight into which characteristics may best be used as indicators of the three low-income family types.

The following summary portrays what might be termed a typical household representative of each of the three poverty types.

[6] Stephen L. Schensul, J. Aathony Paredes, and Pertti J. Pelto, "The Twilight Zone of Poverty: A New Perspective of an Economically Depressed Area," *Human Organization*, XXVII, (Spring, 1968), 30-40.

TYPE I. HOUSEHOLDS

These can be characterized as having a male head 45 years of age, who is native to the county in which he presently resides. The household head has nearly ten years of formal education, is presently married, and has five children. Within his marital lifetime he has moved about three times and has held three different jobs including his present job as a farm tenant. He is satisfied with his present job and does not desire retraining. He has experienced no unemployment within the last year. His average monthly income is about $210 which can possibly be projected to an annual income of approximately $2500.

The family is quite stable. Members of the household tend to be future oriented, possess low anomie, and reflect low isolation. They are in contact with various forms of mass media and participate in a number of organizations outside the household. The household head is favorable toward formal education, is reflected by the children who are experiencing upward occupational mobility upon leaving home. Typically, the Type I family has not experienced major medical costs and, from the standpoint of household facilities, it possesses most of the modern conveniences. In general, the family possesses no unique characteristics which may be seen as a cause of poverty except for the problem of underemployment. Even though steadily employed, the household head tends to be in a low-income occupation and has little desire to change.

The Type I family possesses many of the characteristics set forth by John Kenneth Galbraith in this two fold typology of "case" and "insular" poverty. He points out that many families are in a poverty situation because of environmental circumstances rather than any perculiar quality of the family or its members.[7]

TYPE III. HOUSEHOLDS

The typical Type III household is usually headed by a male; however, this situation may be somewhat tenuous because the family is characterized by occasionally having serious problems with alcoholism. The household head's average age is 40 years, somewhat younger than the head of the Type I family. He is a native of the county in which he presently resides and has an average formal education of eight years. He is presently married, but separation and divorce may be a greater problem than is reflected in the data. Once a family has experienced such a crisis, they often are placed into the CAP poverty category of "public assistance family" whereby the family receives support through welfare. Since these "public assistance families" are not a part of this study, one cannot get a measure of the extent to which divorce and separation might occur among these families. Yet the fact that high family instability is found among the Type III families would tend to suggest that family disintegration is a potential problem.

An average of four children are present in the Type III home and it is not uncommon for both parents to be employed in occupations outside the household. The male head, however, tends to be sporadically employed in a laborer-type occupation in either the non-farm or farm segment. Within their marital lifetime, which is probably shorter than Type I families, they have moved frequently and the male head has held numerous jobs. Presently they have a non-farm residence where the spouse is engaged in a domestic service-worker type occupation within the community. In spite of the male head's sporadic employment, he is not interested in job retraining because this would necessitate relocating outside his native county. The joint household income amounted to an average $217 a month. However, because of the male head's somewhat erratic employment, it may be quite inaccurate to project this figure to an annual income. Such problems as alcoholism, poor health, and high medical costs may mean little monies available for the actual necessities of the household, particularly if the household head is unemployed only several weeks or months a year.

The family is very "present oriented" and reflects high anomie compared to the Type I families. The members of the household are highly "isolated" from the outside because they are without the forms of mass media and social participation typical of the Type I families. That they place little value on formal education is reflected to some extent in the inability of the children to rise above the parents occupationally. The quality of household facilities tends to reflect financial problems since many of what are considered necessary modern living conveniences are not present in the home.

In general, a number of characteristics are unique to the family, which may contribute to poverty and which may characterize Galbraith's "case" poverty type.[8] For example, such features as relatively high anomie, present oriented, sporadic employment in menial jobs, relatively high rates of family instability and alcoholism, less education, as well as comparatively high residential and occupational mobility, tend to bear out the Culture of Poverty assumptions. On the other hand, the finding that Type III families tend to have younger age household heads and smaller family size are exceptions to the Culture of Poverty hypothesis.

[7]Galbraith, John K. *The Affluent Society* (New York: Mentor Books Inc.) 1958, pp. 224-254.
[8]Ibid. pp. 252-254.

TYPE II. HOUSEHOLDS

The Type II family is a mixture of those characteristics possessed by the previously discussed types. Again these families are characterized predominantly by male household heads with an average age of 47 years. The household head is a native of the county in which he presently resides and the family has a non-farm residence. The family characteristics are similar to those of the Type I families. The family is intact, quite stable, and yet smaller with an average of only four children.

The family has moved infrequently since marriage and the male head has held only a few different jobs. Presently the male is employed in a non-laborer occupation usually involved as a craftsman or service worker with little unemployment within the last year. Yet the family income, below that of the Type I family averaged $167 a month or, projected to an annual income of $2000. In comparison to the sporadic employment of the Type III family, the annual income for the Type II family may be substantially higher. Also, the fact that Type III families reflect higher rates of alcoholism, as well as medical costs, would tend to support the possibility that Type II families have a greater amount of monies available to maintain the household and, therefore, they do reflect a higher socio-economic status.

The Type II family reflects "future orientation" and yet possesses high anomie or feeling of being "left out" of society. This family type has low isolation, yet reflects low organizational participation. This lack of isolation may be accounted for by contact with the mass media and visiting outside the home. The Type II family indicates favorable attitudes toward formal education, yet their children show little upward occupational mobility beyond that of their parents.

In general, we find a family type with few unique characteristics which might be considered determinant of its position. It possesses the Type I features of non-laborer occupations, low unemployment rates, low occupational and residential mobility, as well as good health status, high socio-economic status, low rates of alcoholism, and marital stability. On the other hand, it reflects the Type III characteristics of high anomie, low occupational mobility of children, smaller family size, and low organizational participation. It appears to be made up of a number of families who are in the process of becoming either Type I or Type III depending on what programs might be designed to help alleviate their problems.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The Descriptive Phase

Findings from the descriptive phase of this study yielded a number of questions concerning the approaches used in understanding and dealing with the problems of the poor. The following conclusions and implications should be considered in action programs and research designed around the poverty segment of the population.

[1]**Retraining and employment**—Programs designed to provide employment opportunities may not succeed because the majority of household heads are fully employed; the real problem is that of underemployment.

[2]**Median Age**—Median Age of household heads is 47 years with nearly 45 percent of the sample 50 years of age or over. New programs similar to the Green Thumb program (public works employment) need to be initiated to provide for those household heads who do not desire retraining or are considered unemployable.

[3]**Residence**—The combination of birthplace, residential and occupational mobility, and retraining desires, may indicate that programs which require change of residence may have limited appeal to the poor.

[4]**Mass Media**—Agencies attempting to reach the poor would best utilize radio and television; newspapers and magazines are second choice outlets.

[5]**Organizational Participation**—Poverty programs designed around "maximum participation" may yield little success because of reluctance of rural poverty stricken to be "exposed." Programs such as food stamp distribution which require maximum exposure would probably be less successful in involving low-income families than USDA commodity programs which allow minimum exposure of ones poverty status.

Since the church serves as a tie with the community for a number of families, this may be a place to contact some poverty families which have refused exposure through other forms of participation.

[6]**Isolation**—Factors such as lack of experience, motivation, and leadership development are crucial to success of programs demanding participation by the poor.

[7]**Health**—Over one-third of the families were experiencing a serious illness. This would suggest that action programs need to focus greater attention on providing either direct care or financial assistance.

[8]**Family Size**—Findings which indicate average family size of low-income families to be significantly larger than for the population as a whole would support continued use of this variable as a part of any definition of poverty program eligibility.

The Culture of Poverty Analysis

1. The review of previous literature has indicated a debate over the applicability of the Culture of Poverty hypothesis in understanding the poverty segment of American society. Findings from this study of 120 low-income rural families indicate that **attention needs to be given to heterogeneity in the low-income segment of rural American society.**

2. **The fourteen variables** considered as components characteristic of those in poverty must be refined and operationalized to test **which are most and least symptomatic of the Culture of Poverty.**

3. Findings of heterogeneity justify further research to **determine exactly which combination of characteristics most often is reflected by Culture of Poverty and non-Culture of Poverty families.**

4. Persons working with low-income families must consider present-future orientation in their attempts to **understand buying habits and lack of planning among that segment of the poor.**

5. Since **nearly one-half of the 120 families** in the study **can be characterized by high anomie,** persons responsible for making contacts with those families should be aware of their suspicions and possible rejection of such programs.

6. **Attitudes toward education indicate that over one-third of the 120 families were unfavorable toward education.** This may be reflected in the tendency of some low-income families to reject such programs as adult education, retraining programs, and Head Start, and possibly reflect the lack of encouragement for their children in school.

The Typological Analysis

1. **Poverty types do exist.** The policies and programs based on the Culture of Poverty assumption of homogeneity serve the rural poverty stricken only as they provide for those in that segment of the poor (Type III), often at the expense of neglecting the other segments and their special needs.

2. Based on findings of heterogeneity and poverty types, future agency programs and policies should **consider variations in the characteristics possessed by the different types of low-income families.**

3. In light of the "twilight zone" characteristics of Type I families, **special programs need to provide for the unique problems of the Type I poverty families to help them out of their situation and/or prevent them from falling into Type II or Type III poverty.**

4. Since **Type I and II** families are most favorable toward education, **programs designed around furthering the education of adults, as well as their children, will most likely appeal to these groups** and be discouraged by members of the Type III families. Such programs as Head Start will most likely find recruitment easiest among Type I and II families, more difficult among the Type III families.

5. Isolation and organizational participation of the poor indicate that **organizational efforts should be focused on the Type I families.** They reflect higher participation than either of the other family types.

6. Occupational characteristics of the three poverty types indicate that, in the case of the Type I families, one must look outside the family for other factors as cause. **Underemployment** may be seen as such a **factor in Type I,** whereas in **Type II and III,** one might **consider problems such as health, family stability, and alcoholism** in the family rather than circumstances outside the household.

APPENDIX I

Operational Definitions

Educational Attainment: Educational Attainment was defined as the number of years of formal education possessed by the household head at the time of the survey.

Occupation: Previous literature concerning the Culture of Poverty has indicated the poor to be sporadic employment in undesirable jobs. The operational definition of "undesirable job" consisted of grouping the census categories of laborer, private household workers, operatives and sales workers.

Level of Living: The operational definition of "level of living" came through the use of an adaptation of Sewell's Socio-Economic Scale.[1] An updating of the original Sewell short form was necessary to make the Scale applicable to today's household facilities.

Residential Mobility: As a means of providing some measure of the extensiveness of residential mobility, it was decided to use a ratio of number or residential moves to the number of years of marriage.

Health Status: Another characteristic assigned the poverty stricken in America was that of low levels of health.The operational definition used to determine health status was made on the basis of how the individual respondents viewed their family's health situation. The respondent answered "yes" or "no" to a question of whether or not there was a serious illness present in the family at the time of the survey.

[1]William H. Sewell, "A Short Form of the Farm Family Socio-Economic Status Scale" *Rural Sociology*, VIII, No. 2, (June 1943), pp. 175-179.

Perpetuation of Poverty: Another characteristic assigned the poor was that of the tendency to perpetuate their poverty status by passing on to their children the attitudes and way of life of poverty. To test this hypothesis, the researcher used the extent of occupational mobility (attainment of higher prestige occupations) of the children of poverty families as measured through the prestige scores offered by the North-Hatt Occupational Prestige Scale.[2]

Anomie: Anomie is defined as the socio-psychological tendency for one to feel having been left out or alienated from society. The operational definition of anomie as used in this study consisted of utilizing the Srole Anomie Scale aimed at gaining a measure of this tendency.

Present-Future Orientation: One of the characteristics assigned the poverty families by the Culture of Poverty proponents has been that of "present orientation" rather than "future orientation." To determine these types of orientation a scale was designed to measure the respondent's feelings toward "saving," "planning," and "being able to predict what the future might bring."

Isolation: High isolation has been attributed to low-income families by the proponents of the Culture of Poverty. Eight items were used as a means of measuring the extent of isolation. These items referred to access to such media as radio, television, newspapers, and magazines as well as the possession of an automobile, telephone, and the extent to which the parents participated and visited outside the home.

Autocratic-Democratic: The extent of autocratic or democratic characteristics of the household heads involved in this study came about through the use of an adaptation to the "Traditional Family Ideology Index."[3] Four items used to measure the extent of autocratic or democratic characteristics focused on parent to parent, parent to child, and family to society relationships.

Attitudes Toward Education: A measure was designed to determine whether the household heads possessed a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward education. Items referring to such ideas as necessity of education, the contribution of education to meeting the problems of life, and the necessity of education in getting a job were used as a partial measure of this characteristic.

Family Stability: The researchers measured family stability through a set of questions pertaining to the relationship of parents, parents and children, and family to society. Included within these items were the extent of divorce, separation, and desertion which the family experienced. (See Appendix Table 31.)

Economic Security: One of the characteristics assigned to low-income families has been that of low-economic security. Using S. M. Miller's definition, economic security in this study was measured by the extent of the houshold head's unemployment during the last year's time.[4]

Occupational Mobility: By defining the term occupational mobility as the tendency to move from one job to another excessively, an attempt was made to gain a measure of this by using a ratio of the number of years of marriage to the number of jobs the household head had held since time of marriage. This served as a means of comparing individuals who varied by age.

APPENDIX II

Table 1. Age of Household Head for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Age	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
20-24	5	4.2	2	3.8	3	4.5
25-29	8	6.7	1	1.9	7	10.4
30-34	15	12.5	5	9.4	10	14.9
35-39	13	10.8	9	17.0	4	6.0
40-44	16	13.3	9	17.0	7	10.4
45-49	11	9.2	7	13.2	4	6.0
50-54	16	13.3	6	11.3	10	14.9
55-59	18	15.0	8	15.1	10	14.9
60-64	13	10.8	6	11.3	7	10.4
65+	5	4.2	0	0.0	5	7.5
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0
Median age	47.0		43.0		49.0	

Table 2. Sex of Household Head for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Sex of household head	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Male	96	80.0	48	90.6	48	71.6
Female	24	20.0	5	9.4	19	28.4
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 3. Marital Status for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Marital status	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Married	88	73.4	48	90.6	40	59.7
Single and widowed	16	13.3	4	7.5	12	17.9
Separated and divorced	16	13.3	1	1.9	15	22.4
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

[2]Cecil C. North and Paul Hatt, "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation," *Opinion News*, September, 1947, pp. 3-13.

[3]Marvin E. Shaw and Jack M. Wright, *Scales for Measurement of Attitudes*, (New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1967), pp. 66-69.

[4]S. M. Miller, "The American Lower Class: A Typological Approach," *Social Research*, XXXI, (1964), pp. 1-22.

Table 4. Education of Household Head for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Years of education	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0-4	3	2.5	2	3.8	1	1.5
5-7	10	8.3	1	1.9	9	13.4
8	54	45.0	30	56.6	24	35.8
9-11	18	15.0	6	11.3	12	17.9
12	28	23.3	12	22.6	16	23.9
13+	7	5.9	2	3.8	5	7.5
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0
Median	8.0		8.0		8.0	

Table 5. Family Monthly Income for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Family income per month	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0-49	13	10.8	3	5.7	10	14.9
50-99	8	6.7	1	1.9	7	10.4
100-149	22	18.3	13	24.5	9	13.4
150-199	20	16.7	13	24.5	7	10.4
200-249	23	19.2	8	15.1	15	22.5
250-299	11	9.2	5	9.4	6	9.0
300-349	9	7.5	2	3.8	7	10.4
350-399	13	10.8	7	13.2	6	9.0
400-499	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
500+	1	0.8	1	1.9	0	0.0
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0
Median	$192.00		$174.00		$232.00	

Table 6. Size of Family for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Number of persons	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-2	13	10.8	3	5.7	10	14.9
3-4	22	18.3	8	15.1	14	20.9
5-6	26	21.7	11	20.8	15	22.4
7-8	23	19.3	10	18.9	13	19.4
9-10	22	18.8	11	20.8	11	16.4
11-12	7	5.8	6	11.1	1	1.5
13-14	6	5.0	3	5.7	3	4.5
15-16	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
17+	1	0.8	1	1.9	0	0.0
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0
Median	6.0		7.0		6.0	
Mean	6.5					

Table 7. Size of Household for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Number of persons	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	14	11.7	3	5.7	11	16.5
2	14	11.7	5	9.4	9	13.4
3	11	9.2	4	7.5	7	10.4
4	13	10.8	3	5.7	10	14.9
5	11	9.2	3	5.7	8	11.9
6	12	10.0	7	13.2	5	7.5
7	15	12.4	9	17.0	6	9.0
8	5	4.2	4	7.5	1	1.5
9	13	10.8	6	11.3	7	10.4
10+	12	10.0	9	17.0	3	4.5
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0
Median	5.0		7.0		4.0	

Table 8. Occupation of Household Head for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residenc

Occupation	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Clerical and related	2	1.7	0	0.0	2	3.0
Craftsmen, Foremen and related	14	11.7	2	3.8	12	17.9
Laborers	28	23.3	15	28.3	13	19.4
Operatives and related	5	4.2	0	0.0	5	7.5
Private household workers	3	2.5	0	0.0	3	4.5
Professional, technical and related	3	2.5	0	0.0	3	4.5
Proprietors, Managers and officers	36	30.0	32	60.4	4	6.0
Sales workers	3	2.5	0	0.0	3	4.5
Service workers except domestic	10	8.3	2	3.8	8	12.0
Unemployed	4	3.3	0	0.0	4	6.0
Housewife	7	5.8	1	1.9	6	9.0
Unemployable	5	4.2	1	1.9	4	6.0
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 9. Part or Full-Time Employment of Household Head for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Part or full-time	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Full-time	100	83.3	48	90.6	52	77.6
Part-time	20	16.7	5	9.4	15	22.4
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 10. Single and Multiple Job Holding of Household Head for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Single or multiple jobs	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Single	99	82.5	43	81.1	56	83.6
Multiple	20	16.7	10	18.9	10	14.9
Unemployed	1	0.8	0	0.0	1	1.5
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 11. Extent of Unemployment of Household Head in Last Year for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Weeks of unemployment	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
None	86	71.7	50	94.3	36	53.7
0-8	7	5.8	1	1.9	6	9.0
9-16	7	5.8	0	0	7	10.4
17-24	4	3.3	0	0	4	6.0
25 36	4	3.3	1	1.9	3	4.5
37+	10	8.3	1	1.9	9	13.4
No response	2	1.8	0	0	2	3.0
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 12. Desire for Retraining for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Desire for Retraining	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-Farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	38	31.7	13	24.5	25	37.3
No	68	56.7	32	60.4	36	53.7
Undecided	14	11.7	8	15.1	6	9.0
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 13. Reasons For and Against Retraining for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Reasons for and against retraining	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Reasons for:						
Income	18	15.0	6	11.5	12	17.7
Security	4	3.3	2	3.9	2	2.9
Better self	13	10.8	2	3.9	11	16.2
Reasons Against:						
Age	12	10.0	4	7.7	8	11.7
Child in school	3	2.5	1	1.9	2	2.9
Health	8	6.7	2	3.9	6	8.8
Like present job	22	18.3	13	25.0	9	13.2
No response	40	33.3	23	42.2	17	26.6
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 14. Type of Retraining Desired for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Training desired	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Nursing or medical	3	2.5	0	0	3	4.4
Secretarial or office	3	2.5	0	0	3	4.4
Carpentry	5	4.2	2	3.9	3	4.4
Mechanical	10	8.3	4	7.8	6	8.8
Electronics	2	1.7	1	1.9	1	1.5
Agriculture	3	2.5	1	1.9	2	2.9
Welding and machinery	3	2.5	3	5.8	0	0
Teaching	1	0.8	0	0	1	1.5
Service or clerical	2	1.7	1	1.9	1	1.5
Other	1	0.8	0	0	1	1.5
No response	87	72.5	41	76.9	46	69.1
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 15. Occupation of Spouse for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Occupation	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Clerical and related	4	3.3	0	0.0	4	6.0
Craftsmen, foreman and related	2	1.7	0	0.0	2	3.0
Laborers	3	2.5	0	0.0	3	4.5
Operatives and related	4	3.3	2	3.8	2	3.0
Private household workers	5	4.2	1	1.9	4	6.0
Professional, technical, and related	3	2.5	2	3.8	1	1.5
Proprietors, Managers and officers	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Sales workers	4	3.3	1	1.9	3	4.5
Service workers except domestic	24	20.0	11	20.6	13	19.2
Unemployed	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Housewife	66	55.0	34	64.2	32	47.8
No response	5	4.2	2	3.8	3	4.5
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 16. Number of Changes in Residence Since Marriage for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Number of moves since marriage	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
None	29	24.2	11	20.8	18	26.9
1-2	17	14.2	10	18.9	7	10.4
3-4	45	37.5	16	30.2	29	43.3
5-6	17	14.2	9	17.0	8	11.9
7-8	9	7.4	6	11.3	3	4.5
9-10	2	1.7	0	0.0	2	3.0
11+	1	0.8	1	1.9	0	0.0
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0
Median	3		3		4	

Table 17. Birthplace of Household Head for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Birthplace	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
In county	53	44.2	25	47.2	28	41.8
In state	41	34.1	17	32.1	24	35.8
Out-of-state	26	21.7	11	20.8	15	22.4
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 18. Ownership Status for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Ownership status	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Owner	58	48.3	26	49.1	32	47.8
Renter	62	51.7	27	50.9	35	52.2
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 19. Health Status for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Health status	Total sample No.	%	Residence: Farm No.	%	Non-farm No.	%
Poor	44	36.7	20	37.7	24	35.8
Good	76	63.3	33	62.3	43	64.2
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 20. Who in the Family is Seriously Ill for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Persons seriously ill	Total sample No.	%	Residence: Farm No.	%	Non-Farm No.	%
None	74	61.7	32	59.6	42	63.1
Household head	9	7.5	2	3.9	7	10.3
Spouse	6	5.0	1	1.9	5	7.4
Child	20	16.7	14	26.9	6	8.8
Both parents	2	1.7	1	1.9	1	1.5
Parent and child	4	3.3	3	5.8	1	1.5
Several children	1	0.8	0	0	1	1.5
Both parents and a child	1	0.8	0	0	1	1.5
Both parents and several children	3	2.5	0	0	3	4.4
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 21. Type of Illness for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Type of Illness	Total sample No.	%	Residence: Farm No.	%	Non-farm No.	%
Respiratory	4	3.3	2	3.9	2	3.9
Dental	14	11.7	5	9.6	9	13.2
Visual	2	1.7	1	1.9	1	1.5
Bones and organs	8	6.7	5	9.6	3	4.4
Digestive	5	4.2	3	5.8	2	2.9
Circulatory	9	7.5	3	5.8	6	8.8
Nervous system	4	3.3	2	3.9	2	2.9
No response	74	61.6	32	59.5	43	64.4
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 22. Total Medical Costs in the Last Year for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Medical costs in dollars	Total sample No.	%	Residence: Farm No.	%	Non-farm No.	%
0-49	21	17.5	9	17.0	12	17.9
50-99	14	11.7	9	17.0	5	7.5
100-149	20	16.7	6	11.3	14	20.8
150-199	6	5.0	3	5.7	3	4.5
200-249	14	11.7	2	3.8	12	17.9
250-349	8	6.6	6	11.3	2	3.0
350-449	11	9.2	7	13.2	4	6.0
450-999	13	10.8	4	7.5	9	13.4
1,000+	13	10.8	7	13.2	6	9.0
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 23. Sources of Medical Assistance for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Sources of assistance	Total sample No.	%	Residence: Farm No.	%	Non-farm No.	%
None	79	65.8	38	71.1	41	61.8
Welfare	21	17.5	4	7.7	17	25.0
Insurance	6	5.0	1	1.9	5	7.4
Service organizations	11	9.2	9	17.4	2	2.9
Relatives	3	2.5	1	1.9	2	2.9
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 24. Insurance Status for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Insurance status	Total sample No.	%	Residence: Farm No.	%	Non-farm No.	%
None	56	46.7	20	37.7	36	53.8
Health insurance	19	15.8	9	17.1	10	14.9
Life insurance	21	12.5	12	22.6	9	13.4
Both	24	20.0	12	22.6	12	17.9
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 25. Possession of Household Facilities for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Presence of facilities	Total sample Yes	No	Residence: Farm Yes	No	Non-farm Yes	No
Central heating	56	64	18	35	38	29
Air conditioning	4	116	2	51	2	65
Water piped in	96	24	39	14	57	10
Indoor toilet	95	25	36	17	59	8
Bath and shower	93	27	34	19	59	8
Refrigerator	114	6	50	3	64	3
Home freezer	61	59	39	14	22	45
Wash machine	88	32	44	9	44	23
Dryer	32	88	21	32	11	56
Dishwasher	2	118	1	52	1	66
Record player	53	67	22	31	31	36

Table 26. Possession of Radio, Television and Telephone for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

	Total sample No.	%	Residence: Farm No.	%	Non-farm No.	%
Radio						
Yes	116	96.7	52	98.1	64	95.5
No	4	3.3	1	1.9	3	4.5
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0
Television						
Yes	106	88.3	46	86.8	60	89.6
No	14	11.7	7	13.2	7	10.4
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0
Telephone						
Yes	81	67.5	34	64.2	47	70.1
No	39	32.5	19	35.8	20	29.9
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 27. Extent of Newspaper Subscriptions for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Subscription	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
None	53	44.2	26	49.1	27	40.3
Weekly	22	18.3	10	18.9	12	17.9
Bi-weekly	5	4.2	1	1.9	4	6.0
Daily	40	33.3	16	30.2	24	35.8
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 28. Number of Magazines Subscribed for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Number of magazines	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	54	45.0	12	22.6	42	62.7
1-3	51	42.5	31	58.5	20	29.9
4-6	13	10.8	10	18.9	3	4.5
7+	2	1.7	0	0	2	3.0
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 29. Visiting Patterns for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Who they usually visit	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Relatives	89	74.5	40	75.5	49	73.1
Neighbors	6	5.0	2	3.8	4	6.0
Friends	18	15.0	9	17.0	9	13.4
No response	7	5.8	2	3.8	5	7.5
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0

Table 30. Organization Participation for Total Sample by Farm and Non-Farm Residence

Number of organizaions	Total sample		Residence			
			Farm		Non-farm	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
0	28	23.2	11	20.6	17	25.4
1	41	34.1	19	35.9	22	32.8
2	24	20.0	13	24.5	11	16.4
3	9	7.5	3	5.7	6	9.0
4	6	5.0	5	9.4	1	1.5
5	5	4.2	1	1.9	4	6.0
6	4	3.5	0	0	4	6.0
7	2	1.7	1	1.9	1	1.5
8+	1	0.8	0	0	1	1.5
Total	120	100.0	53	100.0	67	100.0
Median	1.0		1.0		1.0	

Table 31. Family Stability Characteristics for Total Sample

	No		Yes		NR		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Parent left home	89	74.2	26	21.7	5	4.2	120	100.0
Child and law	95	79.2	17	14.2	8	6.7	120	100.0
Alcoholism	81	67.5	34	28.3	5	4.2	120	100.0
Child left home	103	85.8	9	7.5	8	6.7	120	100.0
Friction between parents	25	20.8	87	72.5	8	6.7	120	100.0
Parents and law	93	77.5	25	20.8	2	1.7	120	100.0
Friction between parents and children	49	40.8	64	53.3	7	5.8	120	100.0

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Galbraith, John Kenneth. *The Affluent Society*. New York: Mentor Books, Inc., 1958.

Herzog, Elizabeth. "Some Assumptions about the Poor," *The Social Service Review*, XXXVII (December 1963).

Miller, S. M. "The American Lower Class: A Typological Approach," *Social Research*, XXXI (1964).

National Advisory Commission on Poverty, *The People Left Behind*, Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1965.

North, Cecil C., and Paul Hatt, "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation," *Opinion News*, September 1947.

Schensul, Stephen L., J. Anthony Paredes and Pertti J. Pelto, "The Twilight Zone of Poverty: A New Perspective on an Economically Depressed Area," *Human Organization*, XXXVII (Spring 1968).

Sewell, William H. "A Short Form of the Farm Family Socio-Economic Status Scale," *Rural Sociology*, VIII (June 1943).

Shaw, Marvin E., and Jack M. Wright, *Scales for Measurement of Attitudes*. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1967.

United States Department of Agriculture. *Some Notes on the Quality of Living*. Bulletin No. 52, Washington, D. C.: Federal Extension Service, June 1969.

Selected References Relating to Poverty

Becker, Howard S. *The Outsiders*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963.

Bryan, Colgan Hobson. "Breaking the Poverty Cycle: An Investigation into the Correlates of Propensity for Change Among the Rural Impoverished in the Mississippi Delta." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Department of Sociology, Louisiana State University, May 1968.

Burgess, Elaine. "Poverty and Dependency: Some Selected Characteristics," *Journal of Social Issues*, XXI (January 1965).

Chilman, Catherine S. "The Crisis and Challenge of Low-Income Families in the 1960's," *Journal of Marriage and Family*, XXVI (February 1964).

Clark, Kenneth B. *Dark Ghetto*. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Cohen, Jerome. "Social Work and the Culture of Poverty," *Social Work*, IX (January 1964).

Gans, Herbert. *The Urban Villagers*. New York: Macmillan Press, 1962.

Gladwin, Thomas. "The Anthropologist's View of Poverty," *The Social Welfare Forum*, XXII (1961).

Glazer, Nathan, and Daniel P. Moynihan, *Beyond the Melting Pot*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 1963.

Harrington, Michael. *The Other America*. New York: Macmillan Press, 1962.

Hodges, Harold M., and W. Clayton Lane. *Social Stratification*. Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1968.

Hollingshead, August B., and F. C. Redlich. *Social Class and Mental Illness*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

Irelan, Lola, and Arthur Besner. "Low Income Outlook on Life," *Welfare Respondents, III* (September 1965).

Kramer, Ralph M. *Participation of the Poor*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

Lewis, Oscar. *Five Families: Mexican Case Studies in the Culture of Poverty*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1969.

———. *La Vida: A Puerto Rican Family in the Culture of Poverty*. New York, Random House, 1966.

Liebow, Eliot. *Tally's Corner*. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1967.

Meir, D. L., and William Bell. "Anomie and Differential Access to the Achievement of Life Goals," *American Sociological Review*, XXIV (April 1959).

Miller, Walter B. "Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency," *Journal of Social Issues*, XIV (1958).

Ramsey, Ralph H. *Forms and Scope of Poverty in Kentucky*. Resource Development Series No. 10, Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky, Agricultural Experiment Station, 1967.

Roach, Jack L. *Social Stratification in the United States*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1949.

Satterlee, James L. "Characteristics of Low-Income Families in Eastern South Dakota: An Examination of the Culture of Poverty Concept," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Department of Rural Sociology, South Dakota State University, May 1970.

Stuby, Richard G. "A Family Structure Approach to the Analysis of Poverty." Unpublished manuscript, Department of Sociology, Pennsylvania State University, 1968.

Valentine, Charles A. Culture and Poverty. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

Willie, Charles, and Janet Weinandy. "The Structure and Composition of Problem and Stable Families in a Low-Income Population." *Marriage and Family Living*, XXV (November 1936).

Yancey, William L. *The Culture of Poverty: Not So Much Parsimony*. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Mental Health, 1968.